The Falsity
of the
Theory of Evolution

Rev. A. M. SKELLY, O. P.

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

THE FALSITY OF THE THEORY OF EVOLUTION

Reply of

REV. A. M. SKELLY, O. P.,
Seattle, Washington, to

Dr. E. Victor Smith, Professor of Zoology, in the State University of Washington, on

"THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN"
In two lectures.

Nihil Obstat,
FR. T. R. NEWELL, O. P. S. T. M.

Imprimi Potest
FR. A. L. McMAHON, O. P. S. T. M.

Nihil Obstat
D. A. HANLY, Censor Librorum.
Seattle, Wash., Sept. 1, 1915.

Imprimatur,
EDW. J. O'DEA, Bishop of Seattle.
Seattle, Wash., Sept. 4, 1915.

Acc: 11878

INDEX

Page

Letter of commendation by Edw. J. O'Dea, Bishop of Seattle 5

FIRST LECTURE

Statement of the Question 7
Creation—A Fact—Not a Theory 10
Paleontological Finds—Wild Inferences 12
Fanciful Pictures—Fanciful Ancestors of Man—Views of Quatrefages 16
The Cave Man—Views of Virchow and Gerard 18
Wild Statements—No Proofs 21
Lame Horse Testimony 26
Haeckel the "Faker" 29
Un-natural History 34
World's Greatest Scientists Reject Evolution 39
Teachings of the Universities a National Danger 42

SECOND LECTURE

Theory of Continental Origin 45
Atomic System of Philosophy Root Origin of Theory 48
What About the Beginning? 52
Theory Fails to Throw Light on the Mystery of Life 54
False Psycology 59
System Wholly Immoral 62
Spirituality of the Soul Demonstrated 65
Cosmogony of Moses—First Day of Creation 69
Second, Third, and Fourth Days 74
Fifth and Sixth Days 78
Sixth Day Continued—The Creation of Man 81

LETTER OF BISHOP EDW. J. O'DEA, D. D.
Bishop of Seattle, Washington.

Bishop's House, No. 804 Ninth Avenue, Seattle.

March 18, 1915.

Rev. A. M. Skelly, O. P.,
No. 5041 Ninth Avenue N. E., Seattle.

Dear Rev. Father:

I have read with much profit and pleasure your learned and interesting articles in the *Catholic Northwest Progress* on "The Origin and Antiquity of Man," in reply to the lecture on the same subject by Dr. E. Victor Smith of the University of Washington. Your excellent articles on this much abused subject should be preserved in proper form by having them printed, bound, and distributed generously, that the general public may avail of the truthful information they contain. I sincerely hope you will be able to do this for the cause of truth and science.

Yours sincerely in *Sso. Corde Jesu,*

EDW. J. O'DEA,
Bishop of Seattle.

FIRST LECTURE

3RD DECEMBER, 1914

STATEMENT OF THE QUESTION

On Wednesday evening, the 11th of November, in Bagley Hall of the University of Washington, a lecture was given under the auspices of the university. It was the second of a series of popular lectures on scientific and other subjects projected by the university authorities.

The lecturer on the occasion was Dr. E. Victor Smith, professor of zoology in the university, and the subject chosen was *"The Origin and Antiquity of Man."* The subject, always an interesting one, drew a crowded audience, composed in part of the outside public, but mainly, as it seemed to me, of university students of both sexes.

We thought we were going to be enlightened and our thought ennobled by a worthy presentation of a great subject—the life history of our race, who were made, as a great authority assures, "to the image and likeness of God." What was our disappointment and indignation to find that the lecturer would have

us descend through many foul forms of beastly life from germ plasm down to our most immediate ancestor, the chimpanzee.

Now, Mr. Smith is, I understand, a very learned zoologist. He can arrange birds' eggs in a row and tell you at a glance from their shape and spots the species and the characteristics of the different birds that laid them. Given the jaw-bone of an animal, he can tell to an ace whether it belonged to an ass, or to a cave-bear, or a mastodon, and can, moreover, tell you the day the possessor died, and what complaint it died of, so many millions of years before the ice age. Given the big toe of a human fossil, he can construct the whole figure of the man, tell you the color of his beard, the thickness of his skull, his brain capacity, and how many generations he was removed from the patriarchal monkey.

But, my friends, in the higher sciences of ontology and special metaphysics which treat of being in general, of the formation of the universe, of the human soul, of man's place in the hierarchy of beings, his characteristics, and his destiny; your zoologist and your comparative anatomist is completely at sea, and as impotent to give you reliable information as the child in the infant grade at the school over the way.

But learned professors of zoology do not see their limitations, and when they don their cap and gown they think themselves competent to teach the world. Nor do they stick at intruding themselves into the teaching of subjects of which they know nothing; like the harpies of old of whom the poets tell us, they must foul all about them, and outrage our deepest religious feelings, our humanity, and our common sense, by telling us, forsooth, that *their* investigations in their particular line of study show us conclusively that we are descended from monkeys and other foul forms of brute creation; that we are no longer to look up to God, the Eternal, as our Creator and Father; but only to the neighboring gum tree, where we shall see our august ancestor grinning and crunching nuts, staying himself the while with his tail twisted round the forked branch, while he is performing that useful operation.

My friends, the degradation of science by false teachers and their abuse of their intellect is no new thing in the world. St. Paul, long ago, denounced the pseudo-philosophers of the ancient world by telling them that "professing themselves wise they became fools, and they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things; and for this degrada-

tion of His glory God gave them up to the desires of their hearts; wherefore, they became vain in their thoughts and their foolish heart was darkened."—Rom. I, 21-24.

Nor are they content with profaning God's image in His creature. They, in their audacity, would assail the Eternal Himself; push Him from his glory-seat, and deny His existence in the world. For this "they are inexcusable," says the great apostle, "because that when they knew God they have not glorified Him as God, or given thanks, and therefore the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and injustice of those men who detain the truth of God in injustice."—Rom. I, 20-21.

CREATION A FACT—NOT A THEORY

Mr. Smith is not only a distinguished zoologist, but is moreover, I understand, a professing clergyman of the Methodist persuasion, and an eloquent preacher to boot.

On Sundays he goes into the pulpit and preaches the Gospel of Christ, and exhorts his hearers to revere and worship God, the Creator.

On Mondays he dons the professor's cap and gown and tells his pupils in the lecture hall as he told us, that "there are two theories to account for

the origin of man. The first, and by far the oldest, is the creation theory, and the second is the evolution theory."

Now, right here I take issue with him. Creation, I claim, is not a theory. It is a fact. What is a theory? It is a tentative explanation of phenomena. A good example is evolution itself. It is a tentative explanation—a very foolish one, according to the best thinkers of the age—of the phenomena of the universe.

But creation is not such. It is a fact, and a fact made known to us by the highest of all authorities, revelation, or the authority of God Himself.

"The former," he tells us—that is, the creation theory—"is founded on authority; the latter," the theory of evolution, "upon investigation." He does not say on what authority. Does he want us to draw the conclusion that it is founded on unreliable authority—the authority of Scripture, when he contrasts it with investigation—we shall see on what kind of investigation by and bye?

"The former is accepted," he says, "on faith." O, yes, we believe it with our whole hearts! because Thou, O, Truth Eternal! hast revealed it!—"the latter upon the evidence that can be piled up in its favor."

With this introduction, the lecturer goes on to outrage our deepest sentiments of religion, our self-respect, our humanity, and our common sense, by proceeding to show that we, instead of being the masterpiece of God's hand, made to His own increated image and likeness, are merely the descendants of the gibbering and snarling monkey.

PALEONTOLOGICAL FINDS—WILD INFERENCES

The lecturer, after throwing on the screen some interesting views of the Grand Canon of the Colorado, some Laurencian landscapes, and scapes of the Thames Valley, London, which he truly said was one of the most interesting geological tracts on our planet, fixed upon a geological find. It was the more or less well-preserved remains of a young girl found on the shelving line facing the North Sea, on the east coast of England.

From the depth of soil in which the remains were found and other circumstances showing an undisturbed condition of the body, he concluded that it was of one who lived some 4,000 years ago. He ably showed from the development of the bones and muscles and the tendons of the right arm as compared with the left, and from other well known characteristics that she was a well-developed young

woman of twenty-three, and right-handed, and from a pint or so of matter found in the stomach, that her last meal was of dog-berries and other wild fruits, the name of which I did not catch—and here comes a characteristic instance of the methods of deduction employed by the evolutionists.

From the instance—from this one instance, mark you—of dog-berries and wild fruits being found in the stomach of this girl, he would have us draw the general conclusion that men in this rude age lived on wild fruits and berries.

Now, we know from the classical authors, that when Julius Caesar invaded Britain, some 2,000 years later: that is to say, a little before the Christian era, the Britons were not very far advanced in culture. But are we to infer that because this young girl ate dog-berries and other wild fruits on the morning of her death; therefore, this was the ordinary food of the people of the time?

The lecturer, forsooth, was never a young man himself of twenty-three. Of course, he was always the scientist. He wouldn't for the life of him when he was of that age, take, as we say in our country, a grannie's bite of blackberries or other wild fruits. Above all, he would not endanger his life by eating too much of the delicious wild fruits when they were in season and displaying their tempting flavor

from every thicket; as, possibly, this young woman did on that bright September morning before she died.

Why, he could have gone back some thousand years farther and found wheat ears and other cereals in the mummy chests of Egypt; wheat, I say, which has germinated in our own days, after its long sleep in the tomb; and the product of which can be purchased at a premium from our good old friend, Pastor Russell of the Brooklyn Tabernacle, whom many of you may know. He could have found the breasts and ears of dainty Egyptian ladies decked with gold ornaments, and turquoise, and other precious gems. Nay, he could have found those "things of beauty and a joy forever," namely, gold teeth, in the mouths of Egyptian men and women of that remote epoch. So that from this one find with its accompaniments we cannot come to the general conclusion that mankind in general had not yet fully evolved from the savage state to that of culture and progress.

Next, he gave us the example of the skull of a man found thirty feet deep in the soil when digging the Tilsbury docks in East London. Now, scientists, as he calls them (everbody is a scientist in these days, from the man who spends his nights and days in the laboratory down to the man who talks or

writes on scientific subjects; just as everyone who contributes to our breakfast table entertainment is a journalist, whether he be the leader writer, or the junior reporter, or the printer's devil, the man who sets the type, or folds the sheets, or the small boy who, with a well-directed aim, lands the morning newspaper on the central pane of your hall door): scientists, he says, calculate a thousand years for the accretion of every foot of stratum on the surface of the earth; so that they postulate a period of 30,000 years since this man was buried or embedded in the soil in which he lay.

Now, my friends, I know the region about London pretty well. I know the Tilsbury dock quarter in the East End. The soil is formed of silt, deposited by the River Thames in its course to the sea, at Maidestone, some twenty miles or so distant.

It is formed of silt, I say, carried by the river, and as we all know, all large rivers deposit great quantities of silt near their mouths, especially at flood time—sometimes amounting to many inches even at one flood. Of this we have examples in every quarter of the world. We have a conspicuous example in the Columbia river, whose bar has been the crux for our neighbors of Portland now for many years, and which even threatens their future as a great commercial city. We have examples of other

rivers even of moderate volume, raising large deposits of silt to the depth of several feet; so that I would have you take the story of the ages during which the evolutionist scientists would have the Tilsbury dock man sleep beneath the sod with a little grain of salt.

FANCIFUL PICTURES—FANCIFUL ANCESTORS OF MAN

VIEWS OF QUATREFAGES

In his next views the lecturer took a plunge into the middle of his subject by telling how man is descended from the ape.

In this he gave the usual stock in trade statements of the evolutionists, and like them, without condescending to give proofs of any kind, but contented himself with exhibiting on the screen a series of fanciful pictures, doctored of course, by the evolutionist artists, and set according to their views.

One of the views was of the ape coming down from the trees up which he had taken refuge from his more powerful enemies, the monstrous creatures which had lived on the earth, ages before. He descended from the trees, I say, sometime in the tertiary age when those great creatures were become extinct, and tried to walk upright; till in time, like

the crawling baby, his limbs became strengthened, and his forelimbs shortened; and he developed into the man.

Now, this whole tale of man's descent from the ape is contradicted by the representatives of true science, even by many who are not otherwise believers, and they are compelled to this conclusion by the very fundamental principles of the evolutionists themselves.

Thus, for instance, Quatrefages, a great French scientist, in his work, *L'Espece Humane,* published in Paris, 1878, and translated into English by Appleton, 1890, under the title, *The Human Species,* Chap. XI, p. 107, says: "Now man and apes present a very striking contrast in respect to type. The organs, as I have already remarked, correspond almost exactly, term for term; but these organs are arranged after a very different plan. In man, they are so arranged that he is essentially a *walker;* while in apes, they necesitate his being a climber, just as strongly . . . a *walking* animal cannot be descended from a *climbing* one. . . . . The researches of Welker upon the sphenoidal angle of Virchow lead to the same conclusion; for, in man the angle diminishes from the time of birth, whilst in the ape it is always increasing; so much so that sometimes it is effaced."

"In the ape (again) the temporal sphenoidal convolutions which form the middle lobe, make their appearance and are completed before the anterior convolutions which form the frontal lobe. In man, on the contrary, the frontal convolutions are the first to appear, and those of the middle lobe are formed later." "It is evident," he concludes, "especially after the most fundamental principles of Darwinism, that an organized being cannot be a descendant of another whose development is in an inverse order to its own. Consequently, . . . *man cannot be considered as the descendant of any simian type whatever.*" So much from Quatrefages.

THE CAVE MAN—VIEWS OF VIRCHOW AND GERARD

With great confidence he placed upon the screen some reconstructions of the cave man, particularly of one, part of whose skull together with his lower jaw, were found at Neanderthal, in the Netherlands, somewhere, I think, in the fifties, and who, he said, was the type of the man who lived some eighty or a hundred thousand years ago. These reconstructions, I need not tell you, represent the man of this age as existing in a savage state of idiocy and brutality, in his evolution from the ape. Far from me to charge the learned professor with personally doctor-

ing his reconstructions, so as to deceive his audience. These reconstructions, be it remembered, are stock pictures drawn by limelight artists, and drawn to represent the views scientific or otherwise, of the school to which the lecturer belongs. Neither need I tell you what effect a slight dash of the brush here and there has upon the subject. Take the university professor, for instance; strip him of his cap and gown; lay aside his gold-rimmed binoculars; flatten a trifle his beak and nut; add a mickle to the thickness of his skull; project his map; give him a line or two after the contour of the Vatican Hercules; adorn his face with a scrubby beard; cover his body with a shaggy coat of hair; and put a stout club in his hand; and there you have the cave man, the *Troglodyte,* who skulked in dark caves, fed on bears' flesh, and fought with the mastodon.

That this is not a mere personal view of those reconstructions, I will show, by reading for you what the Jesuit, the Rev. Fr. Gerard, himself a distinguished scientist and author, says of them. He was speaking of the "restoration" of a lately discovered fossil at Chapelle-aux-Saints in the department of Corrége, in France, as reproduced by one of the London illustrated journals from the *Illustration* of Paris, Christmas, 1908; and here is what he said: "How much reliance may be placed upon 'restora-

tions' such as we have spoken of may be judged from the fact, that whereas the skeleton was discovered in fragments, not even the *cranium,* which was most fully represented, being complete; while hands and feet were alike wanting; the artist, *though claiming to found his reproduction on scientific evidence alone,* has supplied these out of his own head, and whatever else was needed to make his picture exactly what he thinks it ought to be, including a shaggy vesture of hair, of which, of course, there was no vestige." "Nor," he continues, "can it be said that in this respect the popular illustrator is discountenanced by his scientific chiefs, and, in particular, by Professor Haeckel himself."

But as to finds such as that of the Neanderthal man we were speaking about whose remains were discovered in the fifties; here is what the great Russian scientist Virchow, a man of worldwide reputation, says, in a paper read at the Anthropological Congress, held in Munich, in 1877.

"When we study the quarternary fossil man, who certainly should resemble our original ancestors more than we do . . . we always find a man like ourselves. It is a little over ten years ago that skulls were found in the turf, in the lacustrine deposits, or in the ancient caves. Scientists thought

they saw in them singular characters pointing towards a savage state incompletely developed. . . But such notions are vanishing. The ancient *Troglodytes,* the cave-dwellers, the men of the turf, prove to be quite a respectable society. They have heads of such proportions that many individuals now living would think themselves happy if they had heads as large . . . and when we compare *the whole fossil remains known until now* with the present state of things, we may boldly say that among the men now living there exists a much greater number of individuals relatively inferior than among the fossils in question."

This the testimony of Professor Virchow, and we have the same high authority to say that "men are to be found in the Low Countries at the present day with Neanderthal skulls on their shoulders."

This savage man, as our learned professor would have him, *homo primogenius,* the *Troglodyte,* the cave dweller, lived, they tell us, from 80,000 to 100,000 years ago; which statement, I would have you accept not with a grain, but with a good pinch of salt.

The cave man has another and an altogether different story to tell, which I could repeat for you if I had time.

WILD STATEMENTS—NO PROOFS

But they go further back still, and, as the lecturer stated, would have the *pro-anthropos,* the ape-like ancestor of man, live not only 100,000 years ago, but back 2,000,000 years ago; would even carry him back to the secondary epoch. Nay, the leader and prophet of the cult, Haeckel, gives him quite a respectable lineage with high-sounding Greek names. He gives them in order according to their grade of development from the primitive *moneron,* or germ-plasm, which he tells us is the first living in a chain of sixteen forms; all of which statements I would have you swallow not with a pinch, but with a bucket of salt.

Now, I lay down a challenge to the evolutionist champions, and I defy them to reply to me. Can they show us a single ascertained human fossil going back beyond the quaternary age? Not a single one. They speak of man's descent from the monkey. Can they produce a single intermediate form (there must have been lots of them) between these species? Not a single one. "In vain were we hunting," says Virchow, at the Anthropological Congress of Vienna, 1889. "In vain were we hunting for these missing links which ought to connect man directly with the monkey. The primitive man, the *proanthropos,* has not yet been found . . . At the present moment

we can say that among the peoples of ancient times, none was any nearer to the ape than we are."

They speak of the variability of species; that is to say, the phenomenon of one species devoluting into another. But no, Darwin himself in a letter to Bentham writes: "When we descend to details we cannot prove that a single species has changed." (*Life and Letters,* Vol. III, p. 75.) There must have been, since evolutionists do not admit a preconceived design on the part of nature in her products, nor a Supreme Intelligence directing the process, rudimentary attempts at such a transformation. But no; Nature back through the quarternary, teritary, secondary age is true to her ideals and produces only fully developed species in her creations.

The reptiles, the amphibians, the fishes, the mollusks of the teritary and even the secondary age are perfect in their types. Many of them are as highly organized as sprightly in their contour, as brilliant in their coloring as the creatures that swim the deep today. "The compound eyes and filmy wings of insects," says Sir William Dawson, "the teeth, bones, and scales, of batrachians and fishes; all are as perfectly finished, and many quite as complete and elegant as in the animals of the present day." (*Modern Ideas of Evolution.*) Neither is it true to say of these that their earliest representatives repre-

sented their lowest types. "Fishes appear," he says again, "and some abound in a great variety of species representing types of no mean rank . . . on the land batrachian reptiles now abound, some of them being very high in the sub-class to which they belong." "At later periods of geological chronicle the same sort of story is repeated. At one time it is broad leaved forest trees," he tells us, "that enter on the scene, altogether different from those that went before; at others, lizard-like reptiles, birds, and mammals, each stamped at its first coming with the essential characteristics of its class as we know it today; so that it is impossible, except by violent suppositions to connect them genetically with any predecessors."

But still more important is it to note the mode of appearance of each succeeding class. In the *Evolution* hypothesis a new type of life should make its appearance but gradually, and, as it were, tentatively. But no, as we read in the rocks, this is not the account of the matter. Many new forms appear to have been introduced at one time, and apparently of a sudden entering upon the scene abruptly and in large numbers. Such is the case with ferns, club-mosses, horsetails, and later on, with the more per-

fect fruit-bearing trees; and among animals with corals, lampshells, crinoids, amphibians, reptiles, and mammals. Thus, in what is known to geologists as the *Cambrian* age, we obtain "a vast and varied accession of living things, which appear at once as if by a sudden and simultaneous production of many kinds of animals; the sea swarming with creatures near akin to those which still inhabit it, and nearly as varied. Again, in the latter half of the *Paleozoic* period "we find a number of higher forms breaking upon us with the same apparent suddenness as in the case of the *Cambrian* animals . . . and this not in one locality, but over the whole northern hemisphere." And so on, so that, as Father Gerard concludes, it has to be confessed that it is not the facts of geology which inculcate upon us the truth of *Evolution;* but rather those facts, so far as we know them, have to be explained away in favor of that theory. Nature so far as we have explored her records, knows as little of the manner in which, according to the evolutionary system, her various life forms ought to have come on the stage, as she does of the melting of one form into another; not observed facts, but what Sir William Dawson calls "violent suppositions" being in each case the basis of operations.

LAME HORSE TESTIMONY

Can they (the evolutionists) trace the history of the development of a single species? There is, I avow, the stock case of the *eohippus,* or the five-toed creature, of the size of a fox, as they say, of the early tertiary age developing through the line of the *orohippus,* and the *meso-hippus,* of the middle and later tertiary age into our useful animal, the horse. As a reminiscence of his ancestral form they point out to us the degraded toes in the splint bones, of its fore and aft members. "Of course," says Grant Allen, "everybody knows the wonderful pedigree of the horse and donkey family." So also we find in one of the most recent and dithyrambic of the little books on evolution that "this great service, the affording of unquestionable proof of this momentous theory" (of organic evolution) "mankind owes to its trusty servant the horse," and in any work that undertakes to demonstrate evolution we are pretty sure to find a plate representing the comparative anatomy of the various discovered fossils leading gradually up to that with which we are so familiar.

Unfortunately for the force of the example, all those fossils of the alleged ancestors of the horse discovered up to this have been found in the new world where, as history tells us, there was not a single liv-

ing specimen of the tribe when the Spaniards arrived, some four hundred years ago; so that if the inference were true the ancestors must have become extinct ages before the production of their offspring.

As to the living animal which we see in our streets, it was imported from Europe; and the most distinguished advocates of the *transitionist* school today claim that he is descended from another creature altogether, the *paleotherium,* a creature which would seem to have closely resembled the modern tapir; so we will let the representatives of the different schools of evolution settle their squabbles among themselves while we look on complacently.

Of the American horse, as Father Gerard well remarks, fossil remains have been discovered, and there can therefore be no doubt that any evolutionary process must connect with him the less perfect forms which America has produced. At the same time, as Sir William Dawson remarks, "it is equally certain that had we not known of the American animal, these lower forms would have been unhesitatingly claimed as ancestors of ours." "This simple consideration," he adds, "is sufficient to show that such genealogies are not of the nature of scientific evidence. The horse, in fact, has too many imaginary ancestors."

In reference to those supposed ancestors of the horse we further read in the learned *Text Book of Zoology,* published in 1905 by the then occupant of the chair of that subject in the University of Cambridge, England, as taken notice of by Sir Bertram Windle. "The genus *equus* appears in the *Upper Siwalik* beds, which have been ascribed to the *Miocene* age. It has however been maintained that these beds are really *Lower Pliocene,* or even *Upper Pliocene.* It is clear that the decision of this question is of the utmost importance. If *equus* really existed in the *Upper Miocene* it was antecedent to some of its supposed ancestors.

Again, in the series of equine forms, *meso hippus, Miohippus, Desmathippus, Protohippus,* which are generally considered as coming into the direct line of equine descent, Scott points out that each genus is in some respect or other less modernized than its predecessor. In other words, it would appear that in this succession of North American forms, the earlier forms show, in some points, closer resemblances, to the modern *equus* than to their immediate successors."

The American horse suggests another perplexing question. Traced as we have seen, to a line of ancestors totally different from those of our genus *equus,* he has all the essential characters of that

genus. Accordingly, as Dr. Mivart remarks, "it would appear that evolution must be conducted on principles the very reverse of those generally assumed: not the starting point, but the term to be reached ruling development, and diverse lines of organic structure being conducted to meet in one point."

HAECKEL THE "FAKER"

Our lecturer put on the screen a human embryo in conjunction with embryos of different animals to show their exact similitude in the initial stages of their existence, and the different pre-ancestral forms they pass through in their growth towards maturity. He even showed us with his pointer the rudimentary gills in the human embryo, reminding us of the time when as the humorous reporter says, "our primitive ancestors were tadpoles wiggling in the shallow pools."

Now, I should be sorry to make a charge against Dr. Smith personally of attempting to palm off a fraud on his audience. This, I am confident, he is incapable of. Rather, he himself is the victim of fraud both on the part of his evolutionist masters, and the stock-plate artists in support of their would-be science. For, we must make a great difference, my friends, between the scientist, and the man who

talks or writes on scientific subjects; between the zoologist, for instance; and the professor of zoology. The one spends his days in the laboratory; the other, in the professor's chair, talking to his pupils on more or less scientific subjects. He has to depend for his class matter on such scientific information as the former gives, whether this be the legitimate conclusion of scientific investigation, or only an elaborate attempt at imposture in the scientific world, even as it is practised in the political and commercial.

A conspicuous example is that of Haeckel himself, the great leader and prophet of the evolutionary cult in the world today, as he has been for the last fifty years. In his natural history of creation (*Naturlichen Schopfundsgeschichte*) published in 1868, to support his statement that in their rudimentary stages wholly different animals exactly resemble one another, and thus testify that they are all developments from one identical form; he printed in one place plates which purported to be the embryos of a man, an ape, and a dog; pointing out that they were exactly alike; and elsewhere, three other plates to represent those of a dog, a fowl, and a turtle, similarly indistinguishable.

Presently, however, it was observed by Professor Ruthmeyer, of Basle, that no wonder the objects rep-

resented were precisely similar; as in both instances the same plate had been printed three times over, with only the titles altered; as was proved by accidental scratches and fissures on the face of the blocks. What is still more remarkable, Professor Haeckel did not attempt to deny the charge thus brought against him. But although he described it as a "very foolish blunder" he was by no means inclined to plead guilty to dishonesty or a wish to deceive, defending himself on the extraordinary plea, that inasmuch as these various embryos *are* in fact exactly similar; there can be no dishonesty in so exhibiting them. As he triumphantly put it to his adversaries: "were you to compare the rudimentary embryos themselves, you would be unable to find any distinction between them."

It is clear that even were the fact in accordance with such a statement, there could be no excuse for such a piece of trickery. But are the facts as thus represented? We have such evidence to the contrary as that of Professor Lieberkuhn of Marburg, who in a public lecture to his pupils thus delivered himself:

"Professor Haeckel of Jena maintains in his popular writings that embryos of man and beasts cannot in their earlier stages be distinguished. Gentlemen, I can quite believe that Professor Haeckel

is unable to distinguish those embryos. It does not, however, follow that others cannot do so. Mix together in a bowl all sorts of embryos, and I will tell you the origin of each."

Quite recently, as late as 1908, in reply to similar attacks he published a plea in his own defense; and a very wonderful plea it is. In order to put an end to what he describes as "brutal fuss" and "Christian slanders," he freely confessed that a small proportion of his embryo illustrations, perhaps six or eight per cent, had been "faked"; but then, he urged, this has been done only with regard to those pictures in regard to which the available data are so incomplete or insufficient that, in order to construct an evolutionary series, one is compelled to fill in the *lacunae* with hypotheses and to reconstruct the missing links by comparative synthesis; somewhat like, for instance, the imaginative pictures put upon the screen in Bagley hall.

He declared, moreover, that in this respect he does not stand alone, but that a large number—he says "hundreds"—of the most trusted and esteemed biologists are in exactly the same case, and "doctor" their illustrations to make them tally with evolutionary exigencies.

My friends, what are we to think of the science that has to depend on "faked" drawings and recon-

structions and imaginary pictures to prop it up and galvanize it for a short time into a semblance of life before its utter demolition before the criticisms of true scientists?

From Haeckel we pass on to his disciples who may be likened to the camp followers in the army of science. Here is what the Hon. Thomas Dwight, Parkman professor of anatomy in Harvard university, says of such: "One of our greatest curses has been the atheistic popular lecturer, the purveyor of sham science on the one hand and the hater of religion on the other. He spreads abroad the wildest theories as established facts, clamoring that the whole social fabric, religion and all, should be remodelled to suit the new revelation. He does not know whether there is a God or not; but he does know that man came from an ape. There is no certainty that our senses tell us the truth; yet there is no knowledge but from observation. An idea is nothing but a glorified sensation; idiocy is a reversion (that is, to the original brute-like condition); crime, a disease; free will, a delusion; religion, an emotion. The mischief that such men do is great indeed. The young man sees the popular lecturer praised and flattered; is dazzled by his plausibility and brilliancy. The plain fact that his hero is but

a quack does not occur to him." (*Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist,* page 26.)

UN-NATURAL HISTORY

But the lecturer had other diagrams to show of rudimentary organs in human and other bodies, which, he said, go to show stages of evolution from the lower forms of animal life to the more highly organized, terminating in man. And let me say here that it is in traits and characteristics of objects in the animal and vegetable world that the evolutionist champions luxuriate and give full play to their imagination. In reply, I would say that the best scientists outside of the evolutionist school admit that in the world of nature there are hundreds and thousands of things of which they give no explanation.

But with your evolutionists it is not so. They would wrest from nature all her secrets; and where science fails to give the key their all-comprehending imagination comes to the rescue and supplies an evolutionary reason for all.

Thus, for instance, they will say that the splint bones of the horse are the degenerate toes of the eohippus, when as a five-toed creature he splashed and spluttered in the mud flats of the early tertiary period; that the muscles surrounding the cocyx bone in man refer to the time when, as a member of the

simian family he complacently wagged his tail; that the tips of the ears show that they were once pointed, and their muscles tell of the time when men moved them fore and aft like donkeys. Thus, also, in the world of nature they point to traits of configuration and color and give an explanation for them all according to the tenets of the cult of evolution. They will account for the fact that dogs have tails by saying that they help them to turn, although they admit that hares double equally well without any such help; that the white upturned tails of rabbits are "of the greatest value as signal flags of danger," though one not of the evolutionist school would think rather that they betrayed them to their enemies. They will declare that the sole explanation of the complicated adornments of the peacock and other birds is the superior attractiveness they thereby gain in the eyes of their mates; though we have no evidence at all that their judgment in such matters agrees with ours. They will equally pronounce the warts on the face of the baboon to be decorative adjuncts, though appearing to us disfigurements. They satisfy themselves with such explanations because no others are forthcoming, conceiving their validity to be thereby proved.

In spite, however, of this facile mode of procedure, there are cases, and not a few which, we might ask

them to give an explanation of, and this in the case not of rudimentary, but of fully developed organs. What is the explanation, for instance, of the strange and complicated shields on the heads of certain working ants? What is the practical utility of the spots and stripes wherewith some caterpillars are adorned; since they cannot justify themselves on the ground of sexual attraction, as they do not breed in that stage? What is the utility of the tuft of hair on the turkey's breast? Here are a few questions put by Mr. Mivart to the evolutionists, and I leave them to imagine the answers to them:

"Has any philosopher ever attempted to explain how it is that the Duke of York's island encouraged whiteness in its birds and insects and the Philippines metallic colors? that the aeneas butterflies have tails towards the tropics but never on the equator? that twenty kinds of American trees differ from their nearest European allies in having their leaves less toothed? that dogs bred in India differ notably from their English parents? that at Manila cats exchange their fur for stiff hairs? that the caterpillars of Texas moths taken to England and fed on English walnut leaves developed into moths of aparently a different species? that the Australian fish-bone tree should at different stages of its growth

exhibit such diverse characteristics as to have been classed in different genera?"

"Again, how shall he explain the fact that the feet of birds, as in pigeons and bantams, often produce feathers exactly on the analogy of wings? No one supposes that they are descended from ancestors with four wings and no legs. How, again, have creatures radically different possessed themselves of some one common feature? Thus, an eel and a skate are electrical; a skate and an ant eater have teeth of a structure quite different from anything found in any creature intermediate between them; of venomous fangs there are two classes among serpents, and a third kind is found in a lizard; the pike, the angler fish and some brought from the bottom of the Atlantic by the "Challenger" have hinged teeth, the only feature they have in common. Orchids and asclepias, plants as dissimilar as possible, have the same machinery for their pollen grains, described by Darwin as "a very curious circumstance."

These instances will serve to indicate how supremely little we know of the laws governing life developments; but if we descend towards the root of the matter, to those phenomena which concern the beginnings of life, we find our ignorance still more abismal. No one has ever been able to guess how it is that from one germ proceeds a frog and from

another precisely similar, a salmon or an eagle; or from one egg a cock and from another a hen. How is it that amphibians, as a class, which, we are told, came before reptiles, differ from them in some respects, as to the first stages of growth; and agree in the same respects with mammals; and that a few amphibians differ from their own folk and agree with reptiles. How is it, again, that while frogs and newts are generally born as tadpoles, passing to full maturity only in the perfect state; one frog is never a tadpole even in the egg, and some newts breed as tadpoles? All this and much besides baffles conjecture; and in the face of it, how can we pretend to talk of the shapes life would have assumed in circumstances of our imagining? When there is so much before our eyes that we are utterly incompetent to explain, how can we gravely set ourselves to chalk out the course taken by things that we have never seen? Would it not be far wiser to forego the hopeless attempt to account for what is so obviously beyond us, and instead of seeking to explain the inexplicable to acknowledge with the great observer, I. F. Fabre, that "in truth we know nothing about anything, so far as ultimate truths are concerned. Scientifically considered, nature is a riddle to which human curiosity can find no answer."

WORLD'S GREATEST SCIENTISTS REJECT EVOLUTION

Throughout his lecture Dr. Smith in my opinion abused the term scientist; as if his conclusions were acquiesced in by all the members of the cult: whereas, the fact is, that outside the restricted and daily narrowing coterie of those who still hold on to the coattails of Darwinism the whole trend of opinion in the world of science today is all the other way. As an example of this let me remark that at the banquet given in England to celebrate the coming of age of Darwinism, the words "natural selection;" "the survival of the fittest;" "struggle for life;" the schibboleths of the evolutionists were not even mentioned. True, that among periodical writers, journalists, and writers of that class whose *forte* is literature rather than science, the theory of evolution is taken for granted as proved, and that it holds the field as the only reasonable explanation of the phenomena of nature; when among scientists of the first order, such names, for instance, as Clerk Maxwell, Louis Pasteur, Sir. Geo. Stokes, president of the Royal Society; Lord Kelvin, Sir William Siemens, president of the British association, Professor Balfour Stewart, Professor Tait, Sir John Hershall, Sir William Dawson, Sir David Gill, and others, the

theory has been scouted with ridicule. Here are the words of Lord Kelvin, perhaps the greatest scientist of our age: "I cannot say that with regard to the origin of life science neither affirms nor denies creative power. *Science positively affirms creative and directive power, which she compels us to accept as an article of belief.*" (The Times, 1903.)

In the same manner thirty-two years earlier he told the British Association in his presidential address that "overpowering proofs of intelligence and benevolent design lie around us; showing to us through nature the influence of a free will, and teaching us that all living beings depend upon one everacting Creator and Ruler." (Edinburgh, 1871.) To such eminent men of science as Professors Stewart and Tait, the existence of a Deity Who is the Creator and Upholder of all things is for them "absolutely self-evident." So, Sir William Siemens told the same body (1884) that "all knowledge must lead up to one great result, that of an intelligent recognition of the Creator through His works." So, of Farraday, Sir Isaac Newton, and others, writing in our own language, not to speak of innumerable French, German, and Italian scientists, of the first eminence. Sir Isaac Newton, perhaps the greatest of them all, in his *Principia* holds that to treat of God is a necessary part of natural Philosophy.

Not less disastrous to evolution are the divergent views of its advocates as to the principle on which that evolution is founded. Thus, with Lamarck, one of its earliest exponents, it was on the hypothesis of *compelling circumstances;* with Darwin, on that of *natural selection;* with von Wiessmann, again, the *germ-plasm or neo-Darwinian theory* as it has been called by Romanes; while Dr. Romanes has himself devised a new hypothesis—that of *psycological selection.*

Dr. Mivart opines the origin of living things along several independent lines, while he stigmatizes the proposition that *natural selection* has originated species as "the most absurd of all absurb propositions."

Even Huxley himself, if we are to believe T. B. Crozier (*Fortnightly Review, January,* 1904), "the farther he went the farther he departed from his early belief in *natural selection* as the principal factor in the evolution of species, and the more he became inclined to relegate it to a secondary place." Von Hartmann (*Annalen der Naturphilosophie,* Vol. II, 1903), declares of Darwinism that *"it has been weighed and found wanting."* And others have degraded it beneath the range even of hypothesis.

My friends, that house doesn't seem to be very compactly built concerning which the family have

not yet come to an agreement as to where to place the site of the foundation. Darwinism had its day like many a false system in the world of science before; but its principles, when examined by the light of true investigation could not withstand the force of criticism.

TEACHINGS OF THE UNIVERSITIES A NATIONAL DANGER

Mr. Smith's lecture as to the *theory of man's origin and antiquity* wound up very appropriately with the recital of a low doggerel narrating the story of man's evolution back through the beastly and reptile orders, through the snail and worm kingdom, back to the original germ-plasm—a doggerel, I say, supposed to be recited during a banquet in a fast restaurant, where the company quaff toasts to the health of their brute and reptile sires.

There I leave those would-be scientists who, after renouncing the God of Creation, try by all means to spread abroad the soul destroying and despair provoking gospel of evolution.

But the tragedy of the whole thing is this: Here we have a great institution of learning, frequented by thousands of our young folks of both sexes, of immature intellects, with their simple minds drinking in the soul-destroying draught of this foul sci-

ence, as if it were gospel truth; and this with the sanction and approval of the regency.

Mr. Kincaid, Mr. Smith's fellow zoologist, says that his views co-incide exactly with those of the reverend doctor, and that he is willing to stand sponsor for his statements. He says that "one who opposes the theory of evolution . . . only shows that he is narrow minded and bigotted," and "that the world's leading scientists have, after years of careful study and research, decided that all scientific facts show that the theory of evolution is the only solution of the origin of man." He might not have told us all this. Nor are we appalled by the entrance on the stage of this great name in the world of science. If report be true, and we have reasons to believe it is, there is a whole nest of evolutionists and materialists among the faculty of the university.

And here it is, I say, the the tragedy comes in; that simple fathers and mothers in town and country entrust the jewels of their homes in the formative years of their lives, to be fashioned into materialists and infidels; and to become apostates from the strong believing Christian stock from whom they were descended.

Is it any wonder when drivel of this sort is taught for science, not in one, but in nearly all our universities, and has been taught now for a generation,

that a large percentage of our educated classes are, in the matter of religion, stark infidels, and that as leaders of the people they are spreading the poison of infidelity throughout the length and the breadth of America? Is it any wonder that far-seeing and patriotic men see in all this the speedy dissolution of the United States in social anarchy and corruption?* And that religious-minded men of every shade of religious belief agree with Rev. Dr. Willis, president of the Christian college of Lynchburg, Virginia, when he says: "The American republic is doomed to destruction, because the majority of its college professors are infidels." And he continues, "Unless the college professors of today lay more stress upon the teaching of Christianity instead of sending out into the world students and graduates with a great store of book learning, and with little or no conception of what an upright life should be; this republic will go the way of the first French republic, the Roman republic, and all others, where lack of morals, un-Christian living, and an improper understanding of their neighbors' rights and similar deteriorating elements have held sway."

*Tnere is more ineffable rot being taught in our American universities than can be found in the whole of the ignorant slums of the entire world."—Senator Sherman—debate on literary test, December, 1914.

SECOND LECTURE

10TH DECEMBER, 1914

THEORY OF CONTINENTAL ORIGIN

Dr. Smith in his lecture would have his hearers believe that Charles Darwin was the originator of the theory of evolution.

In this he is incorrect. Darwin was not the originator of the evolution theory, but simply of a modification of the principle on which it was originally founded. As with other sciences or theories, so with evolution; it had its tentative founders, and this in the lucubrations of such materialists as Comte, Cabanis, de Lametrice, de Mailet, Robinet, and others, of the French school. But the man who is primarily identified with the hypothesis as we know it, as an explanation of the phenomena of life, is Lamarck, a noted French zoologist, of the latter part of the eighteenth and first quarter of the nineteenth centuries. This scientist laid down as the cause of the mul'iplication of species the *external circumstances* in which these living things happen to exist. For, according to the conditions, or the different circumstances in which these living things find themselves,

there arise in them different necessities for their self-preservation. "But different necessities," he says, "call up different desires, and," (now I want you to be very attentive to this) "these," that is to say, the desires, "generate corresponding faculties, and these in turn beget organs proper for the exercise of these faculties. The organs finally are developed and perfected by practice. And if this practice or use of the organ is not kept up, it by degrees degenerates and is eliminated." He gives as an example of this degeneration the mole, which, living underground, lost its eyes, inasmuch as they were no longer necessary for its subsistence.

"On the contrary," he continues, "the custom of flesh-eating quadrupeds of planting their claws in the flesh of living creatures in order to devour them, by degrees, separated those claws, and formed on their tips hooked nails, such as we see in them today." Hence, according to this theory, "there exists only one animal, whose different species are only modifications and successive transformations produced as a result of different circumstances."

Charles Darwin adopted and developed the theory of Lamarck as regards the transformation of species; but in place of the circumstances to which the former had recourse, he laid down the theory of *natural selection*. This natural selection is an aptitude in-

herent in each living thing through means of which there are accumulated spontaneously in it, that is to say, in that living thing, preservative and perfective accidents which are transmitted by generation, and so grow in process of time. They grow in successive individuals, so that new species of animals are at last constituted. Hence, man is only the primitive animal which, by successive *natural selections*, arrived at the species of man-ape, which brute is to be regarded as the immediate ancestor, through means of his selection, of the rational man.—*homo sapiens*. As anyone can see for himself, the Darwinian theory differs only *accidentally* from the Lamarckian theory of circumstances. It is the theory that has held the field among materialists since Darwin's time, and was adopted by such men as Huxley, Tyndall, Herbert Spencer, Edward Clodd, Russel Wallace, Grant Allen, and others in the English speaking world, not to speak of many foreigners like Haeckel of Jena and other German and French scientists of the same school.

And as it is the reflection of the opinions of such scientists that is taught in nearly all our universities, and is published broadcast by our periodicals and great dailies; the multitude take it for granted that evolution, from a theory, has passed into the range of a demonstrated science, and the very man

in the street will now, with the help of a strong imagination, assume to give a reason for any phenomenon of nature by attributing to it as cause what Lord Salisbury calls the "comfortable word evolution."

ATOMIC SYSTEM OF PHILOSOPHY ROOT ORIGIN OF THEORY

But not yet have we arrived at the root origin of the theory. We must look for its first beginning in the errors of the atomists Empedocles, Demo-Critus, Leucippus, Epicurus, and others, who were refuted by Aristotle twenty-three hundred years ago. According to them, (and it is the system that is universally in vogue among the evolutionists today), all things originated primarilly in minute particles of matter which filled all space.

Those atoms, of different configuration, and moving in different directions as chance would have them, coalesce and form the basis of everything in nature. Without troubling you with the aberrations of the ancient atomists, or the more recent exponents of the system—Descartes, Newton, and others, let me here give you the latest illustration of the system by one of its most zealous protagonists, namely Mr. Edward Clodd. It is given by him in his latest works, *The Story of Creation,* and *The Primer of Evolution,*

works that are spread broadcast, through the agencies of bookstalls and public libraries, and it shall be given as far as possible in his own words. That it is an authorized version we must judge, as the latter work is dedicated to one of the leaders of the cult, viz., the Right Hon. Thomas H. Huxley.*

"The universe," he says, by which words is designated "all that exists," "is made up of matter and power," the power being material and inherent in the matter. "The problem we have to consider is this: Given matter and power as the raw material of the universe, is the interaction of power upon matter sufficient to account for the totality of non-living and living contents of the universe?" "This question we have to answer in the affirmative." "All changes of state are due to the rearrangement of atoms through the play of attracting forces and repelling energies." "The nebulous stuff of which the universe is the product, held latent within its diffused

*Note—So also other evolutionist writers; thus Büchner —"matter is the origin of all that exists." (apud Bobkin, *The Great Truths of Religion*, p. 227). Tyndall says: "I discern in matter the promise and potency of every form of life." (Ibid. p. 227) and elsewhere: "not only the most ignoble forms of animal life; not alone the exquisite and wonderful mechanism of the human body; but the human mind itself, emotion, will, intellect, and all their phenomena, were once latent in a fiery cloud—at the present moment all our philosophy, all our poetry, all our science, all our art—Plato, Shakespeare, Newton, Raphael—are potential in the fires of the sun." (*Scientific Use of the Imagination, see Haeckel, Grant Allen, etc., Passim.*)

vapors, not only the elements of which the dry land and the waters are built; but also all life, and man into the bargain, with all his works. Life is but an arrangement of matter, so as to live; mind is but an arrangement, so as to think; the chemic lump arrives at the plant and grows; arrives at the quadruped and walks; arrives at the man and thinks."

The process has been this: First, from diffused matter were evolved stellar systems; and "given the play of force and energy upon the diffused matter, the mechanics of the process which resulted in the visible universe are not difficult of explanation." Worlds being thus provided, the next step was to develop life. "The simplest compounds of elements were formed first," he says, "the combination becoming more and more complex, until they reached that subtle form which is the physical basis of life, and which, starting in water as a structureless jelly, has reached its full development in man." For, finally, "mind as a special form of life, takes its place as the highest product of power upon matter."

Man must needs fall under the province of evolution; for, otherwise evolution would not be true; and accordingly, since his appearance on the earth, he has been the principal theatre for the play of its laws. He has developed not only various races, but chiefly various mind products ; society and its

laws, language, morals, and religions. *"The laws of society and of moral conduct being identical, and springing from his inherited knowledge as to what is good for his race; and religion, being a vague and cloudy structure, compounded of ignorance and fear —a state of error through which it was necessary for him to pass on the road to truth; the frenzy of the savage and the extacy of the saint having a common base in undisciplined imagination."* Finally, truth has been reached in the doctrine of evolution: "From the action of mind on mind has arisen that social evolution to which, in a supreme degree, is owing the progress of man in knowledge, whereby he has subdued the earth."

It cannot be denied that here is a very ample bill of fare for our entertainment. Never, surely, was such a feast of reason promised to the mind of man as is in this phliosophy of the totality of things.

It supplies as cause for the totality of things, as you see, and leaves nothing out of consideration, "from a needle to an anchor," as they say, from the chance contact of the particles of the primordial nebula on through every grade of the inorganic and organic world down to "the action of mind on mind from which has arisen that social evolution to which in a supreme degree is owing the progres of man in knowledge whereby he has subdued the earth."

WHAT ABOUT THE BEGINNING?

But, now, before we accept all this, it will doubtless be a part of prudence, first, to examine on what basis all these pretentions rest. What about the beginning? Our evolutionists, I know, being ultra disciples of the Baconian system, "don't like arguments; they want facts."—(*Interview of Professor Smith with press reporter.)* Well, here is a fact of the first importance, namely, the existence through the vast extent of space of nebulous matter, in concommittance with, it is said, its inherent attributes, force and energy. What brought it there? Your evolutionist postulates for it a most unnatural condition of diffusion. For, while one of its attributes, energy, tends to separate the particles of matter and keep them at a distance from one another; the attribute that is most powerful, since it has had the upper hand ever since, namely, force, whether that force be of the nature of affinity, or chemical attraction, or molecular attraction, or gravitation, tends to draw them together. What, I say brought matter there? What put the particles of matter in that most unnatural, yet, advantageous condition to discharge the work of ages?

When, in going along the road, you come upon a watch; and when, in putting your key to it, you find

it completely wound up and going, you say: "Surely this was lost or left here by somebody. It has not fallen from the clouds." And so, when you postulate the matter of the universe found in a most advantageous condition for work, and work over a vast space of time; surely, you say, somebody must have put it there, and in that condition. Here argument is necessary and rises of necessity from the placing of the fact.

When on your way you meet a stone wall, you must either climb over it or turn back. Who, I ask, put the world there, and in that condition?

It won't do to say, as the evolutionists: "The whence of the nebula and its potential life is an abiding mystery that overawes and baffles us." "Of the beginning of what was before the present state of things, we know nothing, and speculation about it is futile." (Edward Clodd.)

More courageous the attitude of the ancient pagan philosophers who postulated an eternity of existence for matter. Their darkened and unenlightened minds could never rise to the conception of the omnipotent act of creation. Therefore, they attributed to this the weakest kind of substance, gross matter: a thing essentially contingent; absolutely finite; and subject to all kinds of composition and corruption; they attributed to it, I say, the fundamental attrib-

ute of the Godhead, the attribute from which spring all His other attributes, namely, an eternal and essential existence.

Pardon me, my friends, for delaying so long on this point. But when we find teachers of our growing generation, not in one but in nearly all our universities and other state institutions of learning claiming that creation is only a theory to be put in comparison with and thrown aside in favor of what I call the fantastic theory of evolution, it is necessar to have a clear understanding of matters.

THEORY FAILS TO THROW LIGHT ON THE MYSTERY OF LIFE

But there are other dikes and obstacles to be got over before we can sniff the free air and ride to the conclusion of universal evolution.

What of the problem of life? What explanation has your evolutionist to offer in regard to this? Alas! "The ultimate cause," he says, "which bringing certain lifeless bodies together, gives living matter as the result, is a profound mystery." That is all. Again, a gulf that may not be passed yawns across our path; and again, just when we want him, our guide is as ignorant as ourselves: while the old story which he asks us to discredit in favor of his own goes unfalteringly on: "And God said: 'Let the

earth bring forth the green herb' . . . and He said: 'Let the waters bring forth the creeping creature having life, and the fowl that may fly over the earth' . . . and 'let the earth bring forth the living creature in its kind,' and it was so done."

But, my friends, they do give us an explanation of the origin of life, and it is as funny as anything yet evolved from their inner consciousness, or rather, from their all-comprehending imagination; for your ordinary evolutionist can imagine anything. They say with Mr. Edward Clodd, "The simplest compounds of elements were formed first, the combinations becoming more and more complex until they reached that subtle form which is the physical basis of life, and which, starting in water as a structureless jelly, has reached its full development in man."

And again, "All things are made of the same stuff differently mixed, bound by one force, stirred by one energy in divers forms," which means that by a certain mixture of chemical elements of subtle essence dead matter can be evolved into living matter. Prof. Haeckel thus theorizes: "After the glowing sphere of the earth has cooled down to a certain degree, drops of fluid water precipitate themselves on the hardened crust of its surface—the first preliminary conditions of organic life. Carbon elements begin their organ-engendering activity, and unite with the

other elements into plasma-combinations capable of growing. One small plasma group oversteps the limits of cohesion and individual growth: it falls asunder into two similar halves. With this first *moneron* begins organic life and its most distinctive function, heredity."

Huxley theorized on his own account and, in 1868, boldly proclaimed that "life originated from *Bathybius,*" the name given to a peculiar kind of slime met with in deep-sea dredgings. Great was the exultation of the materialist school; but, alas for them: their exultation was shortlived. In 1875, Huxley after further consideration was forced to declare, "I fear *Bathybius* is little more than sulphate of lime."

According to other exponents of the system, life, whether in the plant, the brute, or the man, is only an emanation from dead matter through the principle of chemical, and with others, of mechanical action. In other words, their theory is that life is evolved from dead matter by means of spontaneous generation.

But alas, for the success of this hypothesis. The great scientist Pasteur, has knocked the bottom out of it by proving that spontaneous generation has never taken place, and can never take place, and that what was considered the occurrence of the evo-

lution of life from dead matter was only the generation of living organisms from life-germs which, it may be, are floating in the air, or living in the substance in which they are begotten. This even the noted evolutionist, Herbert Spencer, had to confess, admitting that Pasteur had killed the hypothesis of spontaneous generation.

And how in the name of philosophy could it be supposed that chemical or mechanical action could produce living organisms?

Life, whatever be its essence, whether in plant, or animal, or man, is the principle of an intrinsic motion terminating in an imminent action.

The result of chemical union in bodies is not an imminent, but a transient action (or the formation of a third body) as we see in the union of carbon and oxigen in the lighted candle.

And as to mechanical action: why neither does it proceed from an intrinsic principle, nor does it terminate in an imminent action, as is seen in the example of the steam engine.

Did time permit, I might go on to show that physiology demonstrates the vital principle essentially different from principles either chemical or mechanical; and that there is an essential difference between living and non-living things. This the properties which are always present in living things, and which

St. Albert's College Library

are as constantly wanting in dead matter, go to show.

Thus, dead matter coalesces from simple or compound elements according to the laws of chemical composition; on the contrary, the bodies of living things are always composed of a small number of elements which in combination have proportions different from the chemical proportions of dead bodies.

Again, as to structure, non-living matter differs completely from organized bodies. In dead matter it is constantly found that its molecules are either disposed by simple apposition of one to another, or they are united under crystaline forms; on the other hand organic bodies are formed of cells and textiles diversely disposed as the offices of their organism demand; and each part of these has a special disposition.

A third exclusive property of all living things is nutrition by which they agree in generic *ratio,* and differ totally from dead bodies.

These are increased by successive additions, which are however independent of one another; result from mere external and accidental circumstances in which they are found; and are drawn together by no activity or spontaniety.

The very contrary happens in living organisms, for they display constant activity which is proper to

them and which arises from their proper spontaniety, and this activity incessantly changes their constitution by the double motion of decomposition and recomposition which rejects internal elements by which the body is no longer perfected, and to this adds by intus-susception external elements drawn into them.

Hence it is that dead matter is *augmented* in the manner I have described; namely, by addition; but living organisms are *nourished,* which two actions are altogether different; and, therefore, come from different causes.

Lastly, unorganized bodies are formed through means of physical laws, as we see every day. On the contrary, organized bodies are produced only from living bodies by the way of generation.

FALSE PSYCHOLOGY

From the origin of life which the evolutionists have failed to explain or account for, we pass on to the no less interesting study of psychological manifestations; and here, again, your evolutionists are quite at sea. What of the phenomena of sense perceptions as we see them manifested in animals?

A distinguished psychologist of the university of Washington lecturing recently, in Bagley Hall, rightly, reprobated the views of Descartes and Mal-

branche who could see in animals only automata or machines, *sui-generis,* moving themselves spontaneously; and who lay down that what seems in them sensitive cognitions are to be held as only an effect of their peculiar organism, or, more truly, mechanism.

But is not this the outcome of the evolutionist or atomic system of philosophy, which recognizes in sensation only a material motion of the nerves joined to a mechanical reaction of the brain? instead of being, as it truly is, a vital act which we place (and of which we have, or, at least, can have, consciousness), as the result of any impression in any organ of the senses?.

No, irrational animals not only have true sensations, even as we; but they are conscious of what they perceive. For, in the first place, they have exterior senses, sight, hearing, smell, etc., even as we, to whom these senses were given by God, the Author of nature, for no other purpose than for truly perceiving the impressions of sensible things exterior to us.

Then, the phenomena themselves of external sensations, are verified in the more perfect animals, even as in man.

Not only do animals perceive by the senses, but they are conscious that they perceive. 'For," as St.

Augustine says, "an animal would not move itself either in search of anything or to avoid anything, if it were not conscious that it perceives; not indeed, as if *knowing;* for, this is the property of reason, but of *moving,* which indeed it does, not by any of the exterior senses."

Take, for instance, the dog. Let him be dozing drowsily with eyes closed. Something approaches. His attention is attracted; at once he opens his eyes and looks towards that approaching object. Why? Because he is conscious that with eyes closed he does not perceive it. But if he is conscious that he does not see with his eyes closed, we must of necessity grant that he is conscious he sees when he does see.

Perception, then is an *elicited* act on the part of the animal perceiving, and not a mere mechanical reaction of the brain to the fibres of the affected nervous system, as the atomists would claim.

But here is where the lecturer failed, that he seemed not to recognize or be cognizant of any senses in animals other than the five external ones. Hence, speaking of instances of sagacity in animals, he made the remark that they seemed to possess an extra sense. Why, of course they possess internal senses as well as we, in addition to the five external senses. They have memory and often a very long

one, as is well known to drivers of vehicles, who, when they are in perplexity as to the right road home, leave the reins loose on their horse's neck, which will infallibly, especially if on old one, make the right turns, and so reach home without fear of fail.

They have imagination also, as is seen in dogs, which often bark and are otherwise disturbed in their sleep. And why, if not that in their dreams they imagine they see strangers coming, or they are chasing the hare, as they were wont to do in days gone by?

There is besides in animals a certain sense giving them the faculty of distinguishing what will be useful or hurtful to them. For, the sheep will fly from the wolf, not fearing indeed its color, but the enemy; and the swallow collects mud, not because it is pleasing to the sight or taste; but because it is useful to it in forming its nest.

SYSTEM WHOLLY IMMORAL

But here we must make the great distinction, which the evolutionists do not recognize, between the faculties of sense and of reason. The evolutionist, as we have seen, recognizes nothing in man beyond what is in the power of matter to give him; and hence, he allows no essential distinction between

him and the lower creation. Being an infidel by conviction he denies to man a rational and immortal soul; and here eventuate the foul errors of the evolutionist.

As a result of this, man is for him only a superior brute, the ultimate emanation of mere matter, with no sense of responsibility for his acts beyond what the opinions for the time being of the society in which he moves give sanction. Morality is for him founded on no fixed principles of right and wrong. "The moral code," says Edward Clodd, "advances with civilization. The moral sense, or conscience is the outcome of social relations, themselves, the outcome of the need of living. The common interests which impel to combination involve praise or blame of the acts of each individual in the degree that they aid or hinder the wellbeing of all; and this praise or blame," he tells us, "constitutes the moral code: the collective or tribal conscience;" and hence, "where there is no society there is no sin." "The so-called necessary truths and innate ideas of the mind, as of time and space, take their place among transmitted experiences (that is of our man-ape ancestors) being as Herbert Spencer says, 'the constant and infinitely repeated elements of thought of which it is impossible to get rid.' "

"True it is," they admit, that "slavery and superstition, (that is, religion), "have been agents for progress; that in the death-struggle for food curiosity, the mother of knowledge, has been awakened; that in the fight for mates, the germ of the highest and purest love of man for woman has been developed; and that in the conflict between tribes, patriotism and hardy generous virtues have been evolved." "Turbulent elements within, involved the intervention and rule of the ablest; disputes called for the counsel and settlement of the wise; and thus, the rough foundations of law and order were laid." "Evils once deemed inherent in the nature of things, and, therefore, irremovable, are accounted for, and shown to be within our power to extirpate." Moreover, "that which man calls sin is shown to be more often due to his imperfect sense of the proportion of things, and to his lack of imagination, than to his wilfulness." And it is sapiently concluded: "What a dead weight of care do morals thus regarded lift from the heart of man"? "Since morals are due to the social instinct, the highest morality is that wherein each one shares the full life of all." "We are what our forefathers made us, plus the action of circumstances on ourselves." "Threats of punishment, and promises of reward in our after life, exercise no small influence on conduct in law-

less and superstitious ages; . . . but the world is outgrowing these and like beliefs, the origins of which are made clear." The soul during life owes no allegiance to an Eternal Lawgiver; and in death, dies with the body, to sink into an eternal and dishonored oblivion.

Such, the system offered for our acceptance as the result of the researches of these would-be savants now at the commencement of the twentieth century of the Christian era.

No wonder our Divine Lord said twenty centuries ago: "When I shall come (in judgment), do you think, I shall find faith on the earth?"

SPIRITUALITY OF THE SOUL DEMONSTRATED

No, my friends, man's soul is not made of the same stuff as that of the beast. It is superior to terrene matter. It is not evolved from it. We are not the lineal descendants of the orang-outang or the chimpanzee, as some would have us believe, but as greater than they would teach us: "We are the offspring of God," the Eternal; "made to His own image and likeness." A noble life of virtue is expected of us, worthy of the heirs of an eternal beatitude. Our souls are made of spiritual substance. They shall never die. As proof of this we have only to look to their operations. Those operations are

superior to the powers of all matter. And this we prove by a rigorous demonstration; a demonstration which cannot be gainsaid, and to contradict which is to contradict reason itself.

I could, indeed, call to witness to the truth of this fact the consent of the human race. But in favor of those who teach the opinions of the evolutionists, I renounce this testimony and pass it over, and will demonstrate its truth by a rigorous demonstration.

And, first, the human soul performs acts transcending all the powers of matter, whether dead or living. For, it thinks; it wishes; by which acts it is essentially reflextive; or, as scholastic philosophy, that keen rapier which has lost none of its keenness since it was fashioned by the mind of the angelic Dr. St. Thomas of Aquin, seven hundred years ago, says: "It returns on its essence by a complete return," and this reflexive act cannot belong to a corporal subject, as every one, materialist or otherwise, will admit. For the nature of an act proceeding from whatsoever efficient cause, clearly manifests the nature of that principle; in the same manner in which the perfection of an effect demonstrates the perfection of the cause that produced it.

Again, our soul most freely makes excursions beyond the limits of space and time, and this can by

no means belong to the powers of matter; because, the actions of material bodies are limited to their proper quantities, and are exercised in a determined region of space, as our common every-day experience shows us.

In the second place, our soul has perceptions of objects essentially immaterial. We speak, and the materialists speak with us, of spiritual things; that is, of things placed beyond the bounds of all material nature. Therefore, there exist in our mind conceptions of spiritual things. For, we cannot speak of things altogether unknown to us. But a subject which understands objects altogether spiritual cannot but be essentially spiritual. For, each power is ordained to its proper object, as to the term of its perfection; as corporal sight is proportioned to things visible, namely, to light and color to which it is ordained, and by which the faculty of sight, by seeing, is perfected. It cannot hear; it cannot smell. If, therefore, our intellect touches spiritual objects, it must be proportioned to these spiritual things to be received in an intelligent manner, and, consequently, be itself spiritual.

Thirdly, while things existing outside of us in the domian of sensibility are single, multiple, and changeable; we comprehend their essences, nevertheless, by the force of our mind, in a manner uni-

versal, and unchangeable, and reduce them to a certain unity; but this cannot be done solely from the things themselves. For, they manifest themselves to our intellect only in their individuality. It is done, therefore, by the intellectual power of our soul; which, consequently, must be raised above all conditions of matter, and so be spiritual.

There is an axiom in philosophy which I would ask the evolutionists to think seriously over, as it gives the key to the solution of all these things. *"Quidquid recipitur, ad modum subjecti recipitur."* What is received into a subject is received according to the mode of being of that subject. If, then, we come by the knowledge of things, even material things, after a spiritual manner, by our intellect; it is a most certain sign that our intellect itself which knows them is spiritual.

Fourthly, our soul, by a natural and higher aspiration, is drawn more to spiritual than to material things. (I speak of men who are conscious of their own dignity; not of those who perversely abuse their reasonable nature. For, we are not to pay attention to the man who, as the psalmist says: *"when he was in honor did not understand. He is compared to the sensual beasts and is become like to them."*) Our soul, I say, by a natural and higher aspiration, is drawn more to spiritual than to ma-

terial things; but such cannot but be essentially spiritual. For, otherwise this spiritual aspiration in a subject destitute of spirituality would be altogether inexplicable; as, indeed, natural desires lower than the specific nature of the subject in which they are can be understood; but not superior to the specific nature of their subjects. An ass, for instance, has no aspiration to be a man, nor a stone an ass.

Lastly, a natural desire follows only from a cognition by which an object is apprehended as perfective of the appetite. But no object can perfect a subject with which it has nothing in common. Therefore, if spiritual things, as perfecting man are sought, and vehemently sought; it is a most certain sign that the substance of the human soul is essentially and above all spiritual. *The man is, on every ground, therefore, incapable of being evolved from the monkey.*

COSMOGONY OF MOSES—FIRST DAY OF CREATION

I have done now, my friends, with the evolutionists. It remains for me only to go on and lay down for you the Christian system of philosophy; the only one and true system, which gives a reasonable cause for the phenomena of the universe. It is the one that has stood the test of more than three thousand years;

the one from which all that there is of truth in the systems of the materialists and the evolutionists is but a plagarism; the one that wrung from the great scientist, Ampère, the noble confession of the Christian man; for, in contemplating it there is no alternative: *"Either Moses,"* he says, *"knew as much about science as we do"* (in this age of science and research) *"or he was inspired."*

"In the beginning, God created heaven and earth." In the beginning: that is to say, long, long ago. God; namely, the Supreme Being, the Being to Whom belongs essential existence, and Who is, therefore, from eternity: created: that is, drew from nothingness, by the force of His almighty will: heaven and earth—the university of things, or the elements from which under His providential direction what we call heaven and earth were in time to be evolved.

"And the earth," that is, taking a part for the whole, "was void and empty." If we go back to the original Hebrew the words signify shapeless and aeraform: "and darkness was on the face of the deep." This vast shapeless and gaseous chaos gave forth no light or radiance such as we witness in the universe today.

"And the Spirit of God moved over the waters:"

the Holy Spirit of love in benign and beneficient mood *brooded* over the waters; that vast aeraform expanse, as the force of the Hebrew verb would have it: brooded, for, just as the hen broods over her eggs till she bring forth to life her chicks: so, God brooded over the primordial element, so as in time to bring forth from it order, and definite being, and life.

"And God said: 'Be light made,' and light was made." Here we have the true evolution begun under the directing providence of the Creator. The Spirit of love cast His all-seeing glance over that vast expanse of primordial matter and impressed on it His providential will from which proceeds the natural law; not as if He acted from blind necessity, as the materialists would have us believe, but exercising over nature His free and beneficient will. This law He can suspend or alter as it pleases Him; so that it is always easy to Him, when He thinks proper, and for sufficient reasons to work signs and wonders.

"And light was made." As a result of the movement impressed on primordial matter, whether you adopt the nebulous theory of Le Place; or the more generally received modification of it in our day, namely, the meteorite theory propounded by Helmholdt; from the friction of the particles of matter

produced by that motion arose the light or radiance ordered by the Creator, not as if that radiance proceeded from any defined body, as our sun; for, the spheres were not yet evolved from the primeval chaos.

"And God saw the light that it was good; and He divided the light from the darkness, and He called the light day, and the darkness night; and there was evening and morning, one day."

Now with regard to those three terms—day, evening, morning—some elucidation is necessary, and first, what is the meaning of the word day? Does it signify the interval of twenty-four hours during which the earth turns on its axis, such as we designate by the term? No, my friends, that interpretation of the sacred text is unnecessary and improbable. For the earth was not yet formed. Rather, it designates, as St. Augustine taught, long ago, and as the progress of science in our times has shown to be correct, an indefinite period of time during which the Holy Ghost operating through means of the laws of nature brought to a definite stage the evolution of order out of chaos, and through the continuation of which in time were to be produced all inferior things under His creating and directing hand. This the Hebrew word *yom* suggests to us. For, you must know that the Hebrew language in

which the books of Moses were written is not rich in expressions as ours is, and it is obliged to employ metaphorically the word *yom* to express the idea that we attribute to the word *epoch*. And in fact, the word has the same signification in a great many passages of Holy Scripture.

Other considerations prove that Moses employed it *really* in this chapter, not to signify solar days or days of twenty-four hours, but a time whose duration is not determined. He tells us in fact that the sun which serves today to rule our days had not appeared until the fourth *yom*. And the cosmogenic traditions of other ancient peoples, as the Hindus, the Persians, the Etruscans, the Phoenecians, the Chaldeans and others, consider the days of creation as long periods.

After having examined the sense of the word *yom*, or day, it becomes our duty to examine that of *ereb* and *boqer*—evening and morning. Moses, having employed the word day in a metaphorical sense to designate the succession of the revolutions of the world and of creative acts, continues the metaphor by calling the total space of time which flows from one revolution to another, *evening and morning*. He places the evening before the morning because the Hebrews would have the day begin, not as we, at midnight, but from the evening, a usage the traces

of which remain still in the offices of the Church. Some interpretors of scripture, as St. Augustine, and others, explain the evening and morning in the following manner: They say that evening and morning can be received analogically. For, retaining the proper signification of the words *ereb* and *boqer,* the former of which signifies *mixture, confusion;* and the latter has the signification of *opening,* the genesaic evening which is the beginning of the genesaic day can be received for the matter in its unformed state, or for the duration of matter yet in its unformed state; morning, which is the term of the genesaic day can be received for the full completion of the form, by which formation that which was in a state of confusion, is, as it were, opened and displayed.

SECOND, THIRD AND FOURTH DAYS

"And God said: "Let there be a firmament made amidst the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters." Here as elsewhere in scripture, the word *said* is to be taken as the carrying out of, or the expression of His Almighty will.

Let there be a firmament, etc. This expresses the second stage in the ordering of things, where the heavier elements of matter of which our earth is formed had cooled down from the condition of a

fiery sphere into the liquid and solid state, while the lighter elements still persevered in their gaseous state.

"And God made a firmament and divided the waters that were under the firmament from those that were above the firmament"; that is, in a state of vapor, "and it was so."

"And God called the firmament heaven, and the evening and morning were the second day."

"God also said: 'Let the waters that are under the heaven, be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear,' and it was so done. And God called the dry land earth, and the gathering together of the waters, He called seas. And God saw that it was good."

"And He said 'Let the earth bring forth the green herb, and such as may seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, which may have seed in itself upon the earth.' And it was so done."

"And the earth brought forth the green herb, and such as yieldeth seed according to its kind, and the tree that beareth fruit, having seed each one according to its kind. And God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the third day."

Here is a distinct advance in the work of creation —a second creation, if I may so express it; namely,

the production of life—that life which the evolutionists declare they are wholly unable to explain according to their theory, and which they call, therefore, "an inexplicable mystery"; a "mystery which is so profound that it is folly to investigate."

With us, on the contrary, nothing is more simple. God in the exercise of His almighty power produces it, that inexplicable mystery which science has failed to explain, and which will always remain a wonder of His omnipotence and wisdom.

"And the earth brought forth the green herb and such as yieldeth seed according to its kind, and the tree that beareth fruit, having seed each one according to its kind."

Yes, having seed each one according to its kind. For the Almighty, lest mixture breed confusion in His works, fixes the limits of species in plants on the third day; just as on the fifth and sixth, He fixes them in the irrational creatures that live in the waters, or on land.

Darwin, then, may, by means of sexual selection, bring about wondrous changes in his breeds of pigeons, just as the Abbot Mendel or Burbank, the wizard of California, may by pollenzing or grafting bring them about in their varieties of plants or trees; but when man would bring about confusion in nature by endeavoring to break the barriers which

He has set between species and species, kind and kind, God rises in His might and says: "Thus far, O, audacious man, shalt thou go, but thou shalt go no farther."

"And God said: 'Let there be lights made in the firmament of heaven to divide the day and the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years, to shine in the firmament of heaven and to give light upon the earth:' and it was so done."

"And God made two great lights, a greater light to rule the day, and a lesser light to rule the night, and the stars."

"And He set them in the firmament of heaven to shine upon the earth, and to rule the day and the night, and to divide the light and the darkness."

While the changes we have been describing took place in that portion of cosmic matter of which our earth is made, the formation of the heavenly bodies had so far advanced that the vague nebulous radiance caused by the friction of the particles of matter, on the first day, has grown by condensation into the luminous spheres, the sun, and moon, and stars. The two former by reason of their proximity to us in comparison to the latter, contribute chiefly to the illumination of our planet, the most privileged of all the spheres, because here alone rational life is

to be produced, and the God-Man to honor with His presence.

And so, Moses speaking to a primitive people and in the language of the multitude, and not in the technical terms of science, says: "God made two great lights, a greater light to rule the day, and a lesser light to rule the night, and the stars; and God saw that it was good. And the evening and morning were the fourth day."

FIFTH AND SIXTH DAYS

"God also said: 'Let the waters bring forth the creeping creature having life, and the fowl that may fly over the earth under the firmament of heaven.' And God created the great whales, and every living and moving creature, which the waters brought forth according to their kinds, and every winged fowl according to its kind. And God saw that it was good; and He blessed them, saying: 'Increase and multiply; and fill the waters of the sea; and let the birds be multiplied upon the earth.' And the evening and morning were the fifth day."

On the first day of creation the Holy Spirit of God moved over the waters, or that great shapeless and aeraform waste that filled all space, and by His presence blessed it so as to evolve order and life, (for under Him alone is their true evolution) out of chaos

and confusion; and now on the fifth day that blessing has effect on the formed element of water, and at the God's command it produces not merely life, for this He produced on the third day in the creation of the plants, but "the moving creature having life;" that is, the creatures that live in the waters, and the fowl that may fly over the earth under the firmament of heaven. He blessed them, and by that blessing endowed them with fecundity so as to produce offspring according to their kinds.

"And God said: 'Let the earth bring forth the living creature in its kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth, according to their kinds,' and it was so done."

In its kind. All living creatures then were not evolved from the one simple principle, the *moneron or germ-plasm,* as the evolutionists would have it, and thence by a process of *transformation* grow into the various species that we witness in the world today. Rather, they were produced by the Creator *in their kinds*—cattle; that is, domestic animals; and creeping things; and beasts of the earth; the wild creatures of the forest.

He said: "Let the *earth* bring forth the living creature in its kind," to show that these creatures are of the earth, and, therefore, destined to exist only on the earth, and that only for a time. He

says: "Let the earth *bring forth;*" let the natural law have its play under my directing hand, and so leave in the rocks those different strata with their fossil remains to be the wonder of mankind in an after age of investigation and research; so that they may admire the results of My handiwork, and many pay Me the homage of wonder, and thanksgiving, and praise.

It is these fossil remains that the would-be scientists of our age have read so badly; that while studying them they shut their eyes to the glaring fact of the existence of the Creating hand that ages ago made them.

"For this they are inexcusable," says the great apostle, "for that knowing all things under the sun they were ignorant of"; or, rather, they wilfully ignored "Him who was their Creator." "For the invisible things of Him"; that is to say, His invisible Being and His attributes "are *clearly seen,* being understood by the things that are made," even as a cause is known by its effect. "His eternal power also and His Divinity, so that they are inexcusable. Because that when they knew God" (or at least should have known Him, had they not wilfully darkened their understanding), "they have not glorified Him as God, or given thanks." Rather, "they became vain in their thoughts," seeking the notoriety of novelty,

rather than the truth which should be the object of all science, and "therefore their foolish heart was darkened. For professing themselves wise, they became fools, because they changed the truth of God into a lie."

THE CREATION OF MAN

But now, my friends, a period arrives when God pauses in the work of creation, and takes counsel within Himself. What is the purpose of this august counsel of the God-head?

When the Almighty looked down upon His works He saw that among them all there was not one that could admire His wonders or give Him the reasonable homage of service and praise. He would then crown the works of His hands by endowing one being with intelligence and free will. "This being will," as says St. Gregory the Great, "have something in common with all inferior creatures. He will have being in common with the mineral world, life in common with the plants, sensation in common with the animals, intelligence in common with the angels" and God Himself, and his office will be to gather in his own person all the homages of creatures and offer them to God in acts of admiration, and thanksgiving, and obedience, and love, and thus act as high priest of the sensible universe. He designed, moreover, to make him lord of His sensible possessions

here, and to raise him to beautitude in the life to come.

But most of all the Almighty was considering the type of the future God-Man Who should unite human nature to the divine and lift it to the throne of the God-head.

Therefore, as the result of that august counsel of the Blessed Trinity He resolved and "said: 'Let us make man to Our own image and likeness.' And He formed man from the slime of the earth, and He breathed into his face the breath of life, and man became a living soul." He *formed man,* I say, not indirectly through evolution from foul forms of life, but *immediately* and by His own Personal action. And hence St. Luke, when giving the genealogy of our Lord could say:—"Who was of Henos, who was of Seth, who was of Adam, who was of God." (Luke iii, 38.) He *breathed into his face the breath of life,* not vegetative, nor yet sensative, as in the beasts, which are evolved from the earth and perish with the earth; but *spiritual life,* even as that of God Himself from Whom it was exhaled.

This man is made to God's image. He is spiritual (as He), undying (as He), and gifted with a trinity of faculties; memory, and mind, and will. But not merely to the image of his Creator is man made. He is made, moreover, to His likeness; God raises him

to the supernatural order by infusing into his soul sanctifying grace. This is a divine quality adhering to the substance of his soul which gives him a supernatural life, unites him in friendship with God, and is the titledeeds to an eternal kingdom. His faculties, moreover, of mind and will, He strengthens by infusing into them the supernatural virtues, theological and moral, and by conferring on him the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost.

To the first man so endowed, the moral head and founder of his race, He would give a helper and companion like himself. He therfore induces on him a deep slumber, and in the interval builds up from one of his ribs the woman, and introduces her to him as wife.

"And God blessed them, saying: 'Increase, and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it, and rule over the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures that move upon the earth.'

"And God said: 'Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed upon the earth, and all trees that have in themselves seed of their own kind to be your meat. And to all the beasts of the earth and to every fowl of the air, and to all that move upon the earth, and wherein there is life, that they may have to feed upon.' And it was so done.

And God saw all the things that He had made, and that they were very good; and the evening and the morning were the sixth day."

Laus Deo semper.

Other Works by the Same Author

ST. DOMINIC AND THE ROSARY
Price Fifteen Cents

THE OUR FATHER

CUCHULAIN OF MUIRTHEIMHNE
Etc.

11878

215 S42

Skelly, A. M.

AUTHOR

Falsity of the Theory of Evolution,

TITLE

DATE	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED

St. Albert's College Library